

### REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis, in that the term "coil connector" and "spark plug connector", as well as the term "at least two bends" and "three bends" in many of the claims were not provided in the specification. Corrections have been made to the specification in this regard and reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims 2-12, 14, 15 and 17 is therefore respectfully solicited.

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 8, 10 and 12 because in claim 2, claim 8 and claim 10, as well as claim 12, the term "the said" is redundant. Correction has been made in this regard and reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 8, 10 and 12 as amended, is therefore respectfully solicited.

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as indefinite in that in line 2, the term "said coil boot" has no antecedent basis. The Examiner will note that claim 17 has been amended in this regard and reconsideration and allowance of claim 17 is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6 and 7 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the patent to Kathriner, U.S. 2,188,224. The Examiner will note that applicant's independent claim 1 has been cancelled and the recitations incorporated into dependent claim 2 and dependent claim 2 rewritten in independent claim format to include a coil boot provided on one end of the neon light tube and a spark plug boot provided at the opposite end of the neon light tube. These elements are not found in Kathriner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 as independently written, as well as claims 6 and 7 which now depend from claim 2, are no longer anticipated by Kathriner and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 6 and 7 in light of the

amendments to claim 2, is therefore respectfully solicited.

The Examiner further rejected claims 13 and 15 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) in light of the patent to Tooke, U.S. Publication 2003/0146464A1 in view of the patent to Kathriner. The Examiner will note that claim 13 has been cancelled and claim 14 reformatted as an independent claim incorporating the recitations of claim 13 and including a coil boot provided on one end of a light tube at the coil for covering the coil connector and a spark plug boot provided on the opposite end of the light tube at the spark plug for covering the spark plug connector. A close review of both Kathriner and Tooke reveals that these patents fail to detail or suggest a continuous light tube connecting the coil and the spark plug coil connector provided on one end of the light tube for attaching the light tube to the coil, a spark plug connector provided on the opposite end of the light tube for attaching to the spark plug, as well as a coil boot provided on the one end of the light tube at the coil and a spark plug boot provided on the opposite end of the light tube at the spark plug. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art could not review these patents and reasonably find this combination as recited in the newly formatted independent claim 14. Reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 14 and claim 15 which is dependent thereon, is therefore respectfully solicited.

The Examiner further rejected claims 11 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over the patent to Tooke in view of Kathriner and taken further in view of the patent to Woofter, U.S. 2,665,673. The Examiner will note that applicant's claim 11, which recites a flexible corrugation provided in the coil boot, now depends from applicant's claim 6, that in turn, depends from applicant's claim 2 which has been reformatted as an independent claim, as described above. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Woofter patent adds nothing

to either Tooke or Kathriner in defining applicant's invention as embodied in his amended claims 2, 6 and 11. Furthermore, applicant's claim 17 depends from claim 14 and adds at least one flexible corrugation provided in the coil boot. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of applicant's claims 11 and 17 as amended, is respectfully solicited.


The Examiner indicated that claims 2-5, 8-10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and correction of the minor informalities. As noted above, applicant's claim 2 has been reformatted as an independent claim which incorporates the recitations of claim 1 and claim 14 has been similarly reformatted into independent form. Dependent claims 3-5, 9 and 11 are unchanged, while dependent claims 6, 8, 10, 12, 15 and 17 have been amended to properly depend from independent claims 2 and 14, respectively. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of remaining claims 2-12, 14, 15 and 17 as amended, is respectfully solicited.

Claims 19 and 20 stand allowed. The applicant will note that applicant's claim 19 has been amended to change the word "new" to the word "neon".

Every effort has been made to amend applicant's claims in order to define his invention in

the scope to which it is entitled. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-12, 14, 15, and 17 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John M. Harrison  
Reg. No. 24,968  
Attorney for Applicant  
2139 E. Bert Kouns  
Shreveport, LA. 71105  
318/797-3062

September 6, 2005